<div align="center">**Remarks**</div>

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 16, 2007. Claims 41 and 50 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 40 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claim 41, and claim 46 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claim 50. Additional support for the amendments to claims 40 and 46 is found at Figure 4 of the application. Claims 44 and 45 are amended to depend from claim 40. Claims 40, 42-49, and 51 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for at least the following reasons.

I.   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In sections 6-10 of the Action, claims 40-42, 44-48, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Snell (U.S. Patent No. 5,749,908). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

A.   Claims 40-42, 44, 45

Claim 40 is directed to a method in a computing system for modifying a user interface. Claim 40 recites, in part, displaying an identification block identifying the currently running application. Claim 40 also recites that the record toolbar, the notepad, and the note tab are all displayed within the user interface of the currently running application.

Such a method is advantageous because it allows the user to record voice notes in the user interface of an application, as well as to readily identify the active application in which the voice note is being recorded. Application, p. 12, ll. 8-17. This permits the user to accurately store and retrieve voice notes.

Snell discloses a method and apparatus for annotating data in an implantable device programmer using digitally recorded sound. Snell discloses highlighted vertical and horizontal tabs which display information regarding the annotations analogous to that of a filename for a digital document. The tabs "remind the medical specialist of the context of the current screen display." Snell, col. 10, ll. 7-10. For example, Figure 4 of Snell shows an "ECG Machine" tab and a "Parameters" tab selected. The information displayed in the tabs is thus associated with

the parameters of the ECG Machine that are currently being displayed, rather than an indication of the particular application that is currently being run.

In contrast, claim 40 requires displaying an identification block identifying the currently running application. As noted above, Snell fails to disclose such a method. Instead, the tabs disclosed by Snell show information about the currently displayed data, rather than the currently running application.

Further, claim 40 requires that the record toolbar, the notepad, and the note tab are all displayed within the user interface of the currently running application. Snell fails to disclose or suggest such a configuration.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 40, as well as claims 42, 44, and 45 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

B.   Claims 46-48, 50, 51

Claim 46 is directed to a display device having rendered thereon a user interface for displaying an embedded voice note. Claim 46 recites, in part, a note pad defining an area in which both text data and an icon are positioned, wherein the icon refers to an embedded voice note, and wherein the voice note is playable by selecting the icon.

Configuring a device in the manner recited by claim 46 is advantageous, for example, because the icon allows the user to readily identify that a voice note is associated with a particular text note. The user can play the voice note by selecting the icon and pressing the play button. Application, p. 12, ll. 12-17.

Snell discloses a "selection label… displaying a flag letter and a date and time of recording." Snell, col. 17, ll. 47-50. The flag letter simply "informs the medical specialist which voice annotation has been selected." Snell, col. 17, ll. 48-49. Snell fails to disclose or suggest that the flag letter is an icon, or that a voice note is playable by selecting the icon, as recited by claim 46.

Further, the buttons 426, 428, 430, 432, and 434 shown in Figure 17 of Snell simply allow the user to control the playback of a voice annotation. Snell fails to disclose or suggest that these buttons are positioned in an area defined by a note pad that also includes text data. See

Fig. 17 of Snell. Snell therefore fails to disclose a note pad defining an area in which both text data and an icon are positioned, as required by claim 46.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 46, as well as claims 47, 48, and 51 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In sections 11 and 12 of the Action, claims 43 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Snell in view of Murray (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,089). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

Murray fails to overcome the shortcomings of Snell as noted above. Claims 43 and 49 depend from claims 40 and 46, respectively. Therefore, claims 43 and 49 are allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided above with respect to claims 40 and 46. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

III. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: August 24, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471